

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/687,526 | 10/12/2000 | Eric Peel | 07316/080001 | 1042 |
| 7590 08/31/2004 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| ANDERSON, MATTHEW D | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2186 | | | | |

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/687,526

Applicant(s)

PEEL ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew D. Anderson

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7,9-11,14-19 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,7,9-11,14-19,21 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 and 22-25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 9-11, and 14-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thome *et al.* (US Patent # 5,604,884) and Macachor (US Patent 5,452,432).

3. With respect to claims 2, 9, 10-11, 14, 17, and 21, Thome *et al.* disclose:

a memory device comprising a plurality of memory elements, each memory elements having an associated address; a client device; and a bus to pass data between the memory device and the client device, as shown in figure 3;

determining valid bytes in an m-byte word accessed from a burst memory, comprising: receiving a plurality of access parameters; and generating an m-bit enable word from the access parameters and a value of m, said m-bit enable word including at least one valid bit corresponding to at least one valid byte in the m-byte word, by teaching in column 7, line 61, through column 8, line 4, that the CPU 52 operates in a similar manner as the i486 microprocessor, where it asserts an address status signal ADS* indicating that a new valid bus cycle is currently being driven by the CPU 52. When the ADS* signal is asserted, the CPU 52 also drives a signal M/IO* indicating whether the cycle is a memory or I/O operation, a signal W/R* indicating whether the cycle is a write or a read operation and a signal D/C* indicating a

Art Unit: 2186

data or control cycle. The CPU 52 also asserts eight byte enable bits BE7*-BE0* indicating which bytes of the PD data bus are to be read or written by the CPU 52. In general, the cycle is terminated by an external device asserting a burst ready signal BRDY* to the CPU 52, indicating that the external device has presented valid data for a read cycle or has accepted data in response to a write request.

4. With respect to claim 18, Thome *et al.* disclose determining whether the access is a last access required to satisfy a client request, by teaching in column 5, lines 4-7, that after the last rising edge of the CLK signal in a burst cycle, the ADV* signal is negated so that remaining CLK cycles are ignored.

5. With respect to claim 19, Thome *et al.* disclose the bus comprises a read bus and a write bus, as shown by the busses in figure 1 connecting the data in-register and output buffer to the memory array.

6. With respect to claims 2, 9, 14, and 21, Thome *et al.* teach all other limitations of the parent claims, as discussed above, but fail to specifically disclose the request access parameters including a first address and a byte count value. Macachor teaches in column 3, lines 49-53, transmission parameters for burst length, starting address, block size, block count, and byte count.

7. With respect to claim 15, Thome *et al.* disclose the memory controller determining a second address for a subsequent access for the plurality of access parameters, by teaching in column 4, line 65-67, that clocking the counter causes the internal address to point to the next consecutive address location in the memory array.

Art Unit: 2186

8. With respect to claim 16, Thome *et al.* disclose the client storing the second address, by showing in figure 1, address register 26 connected to the clock signal and used to provide the internal address to the memory array.

9. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Thome *et al.* and Macachor before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the burst memory transmission taught by Thome *et al.*, to include a starting address and byte count, as with the burst memory transmission of Macachor, in order to provide user control to vary transmission parameters, as taught by Macachor.

10. Claims 7 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thome *et al.* and Macachor.

11. The difference between Thome *et al.* and Macachor and the claims is the claims recite the value of m being thirty-two, while Thome *et al.* discloses theirs to be eight. However, this specific size value does not have a disclosed purpose nor is it disclosed to overcome any deficiencies in the prior art. As such, the size of m may have been embodied in a number of values. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to utilize the 8-byte word in the burst transmission of Thome *et al.* and Macachor, as disclosed supra, since applicant has not disclosed that a thirty-two byte word in the burst, as opposed to other sizes, overcomes a deficiency in the prior art or is for any stated purpose.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 3-6 and 22-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach or suggest the combination of claim elements specifically including truncating a portion of the first address to produce an n-bit word; generating an enable value from the n-bit word, the byte count value, and the m-value; generating an m-bit pre-shifter enable word from the enable value and the m value; and shifting the bits in the m-bit pre-shifted enable word by a value of the n-bit word.

14. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Amendment

15. In response to the amendment filed 8/2/04: claims 2, 9, 14, and 21 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., generating an enable word based on the first address and byte count) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claimed "access parameters" are not limited to consist solely of the first address and byte count. Therefore, the enable word need not be generated from the first address and byte count, it may be other portions of the "access parameters" from which it is generated.

18. It seems the newly amended language is redundant. For example, claim 2 recites in line 4, "generating an m-bit enable word from the access parameters" and lines 6-7 recite "wherein the access parameters from which the m-bit enable word is generated". Similar instances are found in the other independent claims. Once again, the Examiner maintains that the current claim language does not limit the generation of the enable word solely from the first address and byte count. By use of the word "including" the combination may include elements other than those recited. (see *Ex parte Russell*, 153 USPQ 752 (BdPatApp&Int 1967).) Perhaps language more clearly stating what is including within the access parameters would be in order.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar memory burst transmissions.

Art Unit: 2186

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Anderson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 2nd Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew D. Anderson
August 20, 2004